REMARKS

The Office Action mailed February 7, 2008, considered and rejected claims 1, 4-15, 18, 21, and 28-36. Claims 1, 15, 21, and 28 are amended. No new claims are added. Claims 1, 4-15, 18, 21, and 28-36 are now pending in view of the above amendments. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4-15, 18, 21 and 28-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dettinger* (U.S. Publ. No. 2005/0114329), in view of *Lucovsky* (U.S. Publ. 2003/0131073).[1] Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection for obviousness on the grounds that the references – either individually or in combination – fail to teach or reasonably support each and every element of the rejected claims as amended.

As amended, claim 1 recites, in part:

> an application calling a contact data control to request a first user interface, the contact data control being external to the application; the application receiving the first user interface from the external contact data control and displaying the first user interface; the application receiving at the first user interface a request to access contact data stored in a data store...the application calling the external contact data control to request a second user interface; the application receiving the second user interface from the external contact data control and causing a display device to display the contact data at the second user interface... notwithstanding that the application lacks the configuration to natively access the contact data stored in the data store according to the schema.

That is, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, user interfaces provided by the external contact data control. These user interfaces are operable to receive requests from users to access contact data and to display contact data to users, even though the contact data are stored according to a schema not understood by the application.

By contrast, *Dettinger* teaches a data abstraction model in which the application is presented with a logical representation of the data that is only loosely coupled to the physical representation (schema) according to which the data is actually stored. *Dettinger* teaches nothing with respect to the data abstraction model providing users interfaces. *Lucovsky* teaches schema-based services for accessing data. As part of these schema-based services, *Lucovsky* teach the presentation of an

---

[1] Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

"action menu" to the user by "the device" [0056]. Although the "action menu" is clearly a user interface, *Lucovsky* teaches that "the device" is the entity that is accessing the data, and is therefore analogous to the application, not the services [0007]. Furthermore, the device (application) that presents the user interface is able to present the user interface precisely because it understands the schema [0056]. Thus, neither *Dettinger* nor *Lucovsky*, either individually or in combination, teach user interfaces provided by an external contact data control. At least for this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Likewise, as amended, independent claims 15, 21, and 28 recite user interfaces that are provided to the application by external contact data controls and that are operable to receive requests from users to access contact data and to display contact data to users, even though the contact data are stored according to a schema not understood by the application. Thus, at least for this reason, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claims 15, 21, and 28 be withdrawn.

Claims 4-14, 31, and 36 depend from claim 1. Claims 18 and 32-35 depend from claim 15. Claims 29 and 30 depend from claim 28. As is axiomatic, if an independent claim is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is also not obvious. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 4-14, 31, and 36 be withdrawn at least for the same reasons as claim 1 set forth above. Likewise, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 18 and 32-25 be withdrawn at least for the same reason as claim 15, and that that rejection of claims 29-30 be withdrawn at least for the same reason as claim 28.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner

provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 7th day of August, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/Colby C. Nuttall – Reg. No. 58,146/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
COLBY C. NUTTALL
Registration No. 58,146
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

RDN:CCN:ss:gd
TEMPLATE FOR AMENDMENT D AFTER FINAL FOR OFFICE ACTION MAILED FEBRUARY 07 2008.DOC